

REMARKS

In response to the action of August 24, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 7, and 15 are independent. Claims 1-7 and 15 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the application at, for example, pages 5-7, pages 13-14, FIG. 1 and FIG. 3. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, applicant has amended claims 1-6. The amendment is believed to address all of the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1-6.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ims (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,200) in view of Cheng (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,324). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Ims nor Cheng, nor any proper combination of these references, describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 7, and 15. For example, and as described more fully below, neither Ims nor Cheng describes or suggests generating data subscriptions for the type of data to be distributed in a network of distributed computer systems and distributing a portion of the application data to data sites based on the generated data subscriptions, where each data subscription 1) is generated based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites, the accessed application data, and the distribution criterion and 2) identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites, as recited by claims 1 and 15. Nor do Ims or Cheng describe or suggest data subscriptions for types of application program data that are automatically generated based only on the application data and a distribution criteria for a type of application data, and distributing

portions of the application data from a central database to distributed systems based on the generated data subscriptions, as recited by claim 7.

Amended claim 1 is directed to generating data subscriptions. Claim 1 recites accessing information identifying a type of data to be distributed to data sites, accessing information identifying a distribution criterion that defines the basis upon which the type of data is to be distributed to the data sites, and accessing application data of various data types, including the type of data to be distributed. Claim 1 also recites generating data subscriptions for the type of data to be distributed in a network of distributed computer systems and distributing a portion of the application data to data sites based on the generated data subscriptions. Each data subscription is generated based on the type of data objects to be distributed to data sites, the attribute values of the application data, and the distribution criterion. Each data subscription identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites.

As noted in the application, "[o]ne way to manage the distribution of data is through the use of subscriptions. Data changes, particularly changes to master data records, are propagated to multiple data sites through the use of messages from a central computer system to the other data sites. Based on the message, the data site updates the data stored on the data site. A data site identifies itself as a receiver of a particular type of data change message by 'subscribing' to the publication of the type or types of data changes. Particular employees are associated with each data site, and so, data updates are provided to a data site for use by the employees that use the data site. In many cases, such as when an employee uses a mobile computing device that stores application data (rather than using the mobile computing device to access data stored on a network computer), a data site may be used by only one employee, which may result in the need to generate subscriptions for many data sites. Particularly in such a case, the ability to automatically generate subscriptions, based on application data, to particular kinds of data changes may be advantageous." Application at page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 10.

Ims discloses automatic synchronization of data in a distributed network. See, e.g., Ims at Abstract and col. 4, lines 52-56. More particularly, Ims discloses the use of cached data objects that replicate data stored in a back-end system and are used to respond to requests to access the data stored in the back-end system. See Ims at col. 5: 12-17, 31-35 and 46-49; col. 9,

lines 53-65; and col. 13, lines 36-40. A cached data object includes “processing logic which describes how the object interacts with the back-end data source, and an execution method which invokes this processing logic.” Ims at col. 10: 25-28. A caching policy of a cached data object “specifies when the object is to be periodically refreshed.” Ims at col. 13, lines 56-57. See also Ims at col. 13, line 57 to col. 14, line 7. Based on the caching policy, a cached data object is refreshed. See Ims at col. 14, lines 41-51. The cached data object is refreshed by executing retrieval logic of the cached data object, which sends a request to the back-end data source, which, in turn, sends a fresh copy of data values for the cached data object. See Ims at col. 14, lines 51-57.

As such, Ims discloses a cached data object which sends a request to the back-end data source to refresh the cached data object. Ims’ back-end data source then distributes data to the cached data object in response to the request sent by the cached data object.

Accordingly, Ims does not describe or suggest distributing a portion of the application data to data sites based on generated data subscriptions, where each data subscription is generated based on the type of data objects to be distributed to data sites, the attribute values of the application data, and the distribution criterion, as recited by claim 1.

The action relies on Cheng as disclosing generating data subscriptions in a network of distributed computer systems operating an application program having the application data of the various data types, where each data subscription 1) is generated based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites and the distribution criterion and 2) identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites. See action at page 3, line 18 to page 4, line 3.

Cheng describes techniques for accessing information stored in a database on a database management system. See Cheng at col. 1, lines 6-8. Cheng’s techniques include a replication agent for providing replicated data from the database management system to a remote user. See Cheng at col. 1, lines 8-10. Cheng’s replication agent receives a subscription message from the remote client. See Cheng at col. 3, lines 45-47. Notably, Cheng’s subscription message identifies data that the remote client wants replicated from the database management system and specifies a replication period. See Cheng at col. 3, lines 48-53. Cheng’s data replication agent

accesses and reads a change log stored in the database management system, and transmits changed data to the remote client. See Cheng at col. 3, lines 59-62 and 65-66.

Hence, Cheng's techniques disclose receiving, from a remote client, a subscription message that identifies data to sent to the remote client and transmitting changed data to that remote client in response to the received request. As such, Cheng does not remedy Ims' failure to describe or suggest generating data subscriptions for the type of data to be distributed in a network of distributed computer systems and distributing a portion of the application data to data sites based on the generated data subscriptions, where each data subscription 1) is generated based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites, the accessed application data, and the distribution criterion and 2) identifies a portion of the application data to be distributed to one or more of the data sites, as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, Ims, Cheng, or any proper combination of these references, does not describe or suggest generating data subscriptions for the type of data to be distributed in a network of distributed computer systems and distributing a portion of the application data to data sites based on the generated data subscriptions, where each data subscription is generated based on the type of data to be distributed to data sites, the accessed application data, and the distribution criterion, as recited by claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-6, which depend from independent claim 1.

For the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, Ims or Cheng, alone or in any proper combination, do not describe or suggest data subscriptions for types of application program data that are automatically generated based only on the application data and a distribution criteria for a type of application data, and distributing portions of the application data from a central database to distributed systems based on the generated data subscriptions, as recited by claim 7. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 7 and its dependent claims 8-14.

Independent claim 15 recite similar features in the context of a method. Accordingly, for the reasons noted above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account
No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 24, 2006



Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331